Introduction
In February 2010, Thompson Reuters released a new legal search engine called WestlawNext. WestlawNext’s Google-like searching revolutionized the legal research process, bringing it up-to-date for a generation of new lawyers raised on Google. LexisNexis followed with its own next generation search engine, first releasing it to academic law libraries in December, 2011, and updating it several times. The most recent significant update was September 8, 2014. This study compares the two engines. This poster presents the early results and conclusions.

Methods
Participants answered five legal questions using Lexis Advance and five using WestlawNext. The questions presented common, basic research issues, such as finding a case using a quotation, finding a statute to answer a particular legal question, and finding a case and a secondary source using keywords drawn from a short fact pattern. Participants had up to 15 minutes in each system to complete the five questions. Twenty-five students and thirty librarians completed the study.

Conclusions
• For basic legal research, Lexis Advance and WestlawNext are nearly equal in speed and accuracy. Therefore, commercial users can opt for either, based solely on price and content.
• Speed on Lexis Advance may increase as users become more familiar with the new system.
• Anecdotally, some law students prefer Lexis because of free printing and reward points. These perks could lead to Lexis overtaking Westlaw in popularity among law students.
• Librarians and legal research instructors can confidently present Lexis Advance and WestlawNext as equal though different. In the academic environment, instructors should focus users’ attention on the content, unique features, and the strengths and weaknesses of each system.
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